

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are pending and under consideration.

In the Office Action, Claims 1- 25 were rejected.

With this Amendment, Claims 1-4, 7, 8, 10, 14-17, 20, and 22 were amended. No new matter has been introduced as a result of this amendment.

Accordingly, Claims 1-25 are at issue.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Anticipation Rejection of Claims

Claims 1-9, 11-21 and 23-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over Ishiyama. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 is directed to an information processing apparatus connected to another information processing apparatus.

Claim 1 recites that “a storage unit for storing first position information representing an initial position of said information processing apparatus, and second position information representing an initial position of said another information processing apparatus when communication is established with said another information processing apparatus.”

Claim 1 further recites that “a receiver unit for receiving data from said another information processing apparatus, an acquisition unit for acquiring third position information representing a current position of said information processing apparatus, a first determining unit for determining whether the third position information acquired by said acquisition unit corresponds to the first position information stored in said storage unit, and an authenticator unit for authenticating the data received by said receiver unit, based on the determination of the first position information provided by said first determining unit.”

Thus, as claimed the authentication of the received data is performed based on the determination that the third position information corresponds to the stored first position information. That is, even when the information processing apparatus acquires a current position (new IP address) that is different from the initial position (initial IP address), the authentication is still performed based on the initial IP address of the information processing apparatus.

In contrast, in Ishiyama when mobile computer 2 moves to other networks, an SA gateway update (request for changing the security association to the correspondent) is performed.

That is, the mobile computer 2 searches through the security association database (SAD) to find those which have the destination (dst) address different from the current address, and issues a request to change the previous COA used as the destination in the security association into the current COA, with respect to every such address. Thus, an update request message of the security association is transmitted to all other communication terminals, such as CN 3 of FIG. 6 which registered as a communication object from the mobile computer 2.

As such, the IP address of the mobile computer 2 that is included in the security association is updated in all other communication terminals (see column 12, line 31 to column 13, line 5). Thus, the authentication packet that is generated based on the updated security association is transmitted to other networks. As a result, the authentication process is not performed using the initial IP address, but is based on information that indicates the current position of the mobile computer 2.

Thus, Ishiyama fails to teach or suggest that the authentication is performed based on the initial IP address of the information processing apparatus regardless of the network position of the information processing apparatus.

Accordingly, Claim 1 is allowable over Ishiyama, as are dependent Claims 2–9.

Independent Claims 11–14, and 23–25 recite an analogous distinguishing limitation as that of Claim 1 discussed above. Thus, Claims 11–14, and 23–25 are also allowable over Ishiyama, as are their respective dependent claims.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims

Claims 10 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishiyama as applied to claims 1 and 14 above respectively, and further in view of Karighattam (6,594,776). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 10 and 22 are dependent on Claims 1 and 14, shown above to be allowable over Ishiyama. Thus, Claims 1 and 14 are also patentable over Ishiyama in view of Karighattam, as are Claims 10 and 22 for at least the same reasons.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that Claims 1–25 are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 22, 2006

By: /David R. Metzger/
David R. Metzger
Registration No.: 32,919
SONNENSCHNEIDER NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000